

The Place of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Indian Buddhism*

Jonathan A. Silk

WHAT do we really know about the Lotus Sūtra in India? It hardly needs stating that the Lotus Sūtra is a prominent scripture in East Asian Buddhism, particularly in traditions related to the Tiantai or Tendai, and later on in Japan particularly for Nichiren-affiliated groups. There is also no question that the scripture was highly valued in Central Asia in the medieval period, although naturally our evidence here is much less clear and convincing than that we have for East Asia. However, in fact, it is not at all uncommon to encounter broad claims that the Lotus is one of the most important, if not the uniquely most important, of Buddhist scriptures. While these claims are understandable when made by devotees of the text, they are less understandable when presented as objective, concrete facts.

Almost every textbook or introduction to Buddhism discusses the major scriptures of the Buddhist tradition. And almost invariably, along with the Perfection of Wisdom texts and the Pure Land sūtra, one finds mention of the Lotus as one of the major texts of Mahāyāna Buddhism. But there is something potentially very misleading with such a presentation, for nothing has importance or significance except to some person or persons. Things are not important in the abstract, but only at some time, in some place, and to some person. We should not ask then whether the Lotus is important as such, but rather to whom it is important. And then we must also ask ourselves what it is that makes the text important. By this I do not intend a philosophical or theological question about what doctrines of the text are most profound, the answer to which would tell us much about the investigator but little about the investigated. Rather I intend something more concrete: if we want to claim that something is important for somebody, we must ask in what way that importance is manifest. What is it that someone might say or do which would indicate to us that he considers something important? One answer is that something which one esteems and values, to which he attributes some authority, he finds significant or important. If we want to suggest then that what makes a text important or significant to

some person or persons is that those persons hold it to be of value or authoritative, we must look for signs of that esteem. Such signs are to be found in the actions that people take with respect to the scripture, whether this involves copying it, producing art based upon or inspired by it, lecturing about it, quoting it, and so on and so forth. Without reference to some manifestation of the significance being attributed to a scripture by some person or community, we are not justified in claiming importance for that scripture.

With regard to the Lotus Sūtra in India, the question we must ask is what importance this text may have had to Indian Buddhists. A full treatment of this question would require a consideration of the Indian manuscript evidence, a treatment of textual parallels in other scriptures, investigation of art historical evidence, and so on. We can dispense with one of these items immediately. To the best of my knowledge, there exists at present no known art historical or inscriptional evidence conclusively related to the Lotus in the Indian subcontinent. (I will discuss the so-called *aṣṭabhaya* images of Avalokiteśvara on another occasion.) As for manuscript evidence, as is well known we have precious few Buddhist manuscripts of any kind from ancient India,¹ but what there is comes mostly from Gilgit. There are at least six Lotus manuscripts from Gilgit, as well as manuscripts from Central Asia which may have been written in India, and while it is not possible here to treat them in any detail, one of the interesting things about some of these manuscripts is that they are written in a kind of ornamental script which suggests that they were intended more as objects than as texts to be read. Limitations of space prevent any further consideration of the manuscript evidence here, or the whole set of questions raised by possible parallel passages in other texts, which may show influences from, or on, the Lotus. Rather, I would like to concentrate on the degree to which the text was taken into account by Indian śāstric authors.

In the first place we must note that there is one commentary, extant only in two Chinese translations—or better to say two recensions of one and the same Chinese translation—which claims to be an Indian commentary on the Lotus. The authorship of this commentary, the *Miaofa lianhuajing youbotishe* 妙法蓮華經憂波提舍 or so-called **Saddharma-puṇḍarīkopadeśa*,² is attributed to Vasubandhu. Setting aside the question of whether Vasubandhu may actually be the author, which is problematic, it is quite likely that the commentary is indeed Indian, and its existence should be noted.³ This commentary has been the focus of relatively little attention from modern scholars—although the force of this statement may be blunted by the observation that the same is true of

almost every Indian Buddhist text, and it is worth mentioning only because so much attention is lavished on certain other Lotus Sūtra related materials. On the other hand, there is no trace of the more than 50 Indian commentaries which are said—in a seventh century Chinese reference, on the indirect authority of Paramārtha—to have at one time existed, including works by Nāgārjuna, Sthiramati and so on.⁴ It may well be that the quotations in the **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* of Nāgārjuna and the **Mahāyānāvataṛa* of Sthiramati (or Sāramati) were confused in this late Chinese tradition with the existence of independent commentaries.

In any case, while all of this material certainly deserves our attention, my central focus here is on another form of evidence, that provided to us by unquestionably Indian authors who quote or refer to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. If we are particularly interested in the status of the sūtra in India, the references to the text by Indian Buddhist authors provide a crucial set of hints for us. Of course, aside from the content of the quotations, their mere existence may tell us very interesting things, for example about the circulation and accessibility of the text. In addition, quotations are potentially useful for textual criticism. They provide us a way to augment our knowledge of the textual transmission of the scripture, and indeed, as is well known, since most of the Indian Buddhist scriptural literature is lost in its original Indic language form, often the only Sanskrit fragments we have of a work come from its quotations in the works of later authors.

Unfortunately, as is the case with Indian Buddhist literature as a whole, most of which exists only in Tibetan or Chinese translations, almost all of the texts which refer to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* are also extant not in Sanskrit but only in translations. These translations are obviously of correspondingly less utility for close text-critical comparison, especially since it is often the case that Tibetan and even Chinese translators of śāstras made use of already existing scripture translations when they ran across sūtra quotations in the works they were rendering.

To the best of my knowledge there are only three texts which quote or refer to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in Sanskrit: Ārya-Vimuktisena's *Abhisamayālamkāravṛtti*, Śāntideva's *Śikṣāmuccaya* and Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālamkāraloka*. Of these, the first appeals to the authority of the scripture in only a general way, regarding the nirvāṇa of the śrāvaka, without referring to any specific passage in the text.⁵

Haribhadra refers to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* twice, but quotes from it only once, the famous phrase from chapter two, "There is but one vehicle, no second."⁶ In fact, this expression is quoted by a number of

authors, though perhaps not as often as we might have expected given the apparent importance of the idea, even in India. The phrase also appears, attributed to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*,⁷ the *Tarkajvālā* of Bhāvaviveka,⁸ Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*,⁹ and Asvabhava's *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāraṭīkā*,¹⁰ and unattributed in the **Mahāyānāvātāra*.¹¹

Śāntideva's *Śīkamuccaya* is the only Sanskrit text to quote the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* at length. It contains several sections of verses from the sūtra, and one line of prose, from chapters 2 and 13, that is, the *Upāyakauśalya* or Skillful Means and *Sukhavihāra* or Ease in Practice chapters. As far as I have been able to judge, without access to the best available textual collations, the recension quoted by Śāntideva is closest to the Nepalese as basically represented in the edition of Kern and Nanjio, and generally not at all like the so-called Kashgar or Gilgit recensions. It is quite common for Śāntideva to quote somewhat selectively, and so, while the readings of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* are no doubt of significant text-critical value, it is very questionable whether the omission of a prose passage amidst a series of verses allows us to hypothesize, as did Kiyota Jakuun,¹² that the passage not found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* was actually missing from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* available to Śāntideva. A careful comparison of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* readings with the collations of other known manuscripts may or may not allow us to gain a good picture of exactly what sort of text Śāntideva actually had before him. I have included below a preliminary edition of the three *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passages, with their corresponding Tibetan and Chinese translations. Limitations of space prevent a detailed analysis of these passages, but it may be mentioned that in principle the Tibetan and Chinese translations copy the canonical versions of the sūtra passages being quoted, those found in the Kanjur and Kumārajīva's translation, respectively.

It is likewise not possible to detail in the space available here all the quotations and references to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* heretofore identified in texts of Indian origin, but we may simply list the following texts as containing such quotations and references: the *Sūtrasamuccaya* attributed (I think probably wrongly) to Nāgārjuna, Bhāvaviveka's *Tarkajvālā*, Candrakīrti's *Catuḥśatakaṭīkā* and *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* (along with Jayānanda's *Madhyamakāvātāraṭīkā*), Jñānagarbha's *Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇīṭīkā*, Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*, Asvabhava's *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāraṭīkā* and Sthiramati's *Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya*, Avalokitavṛata's *Prajñāpradīpaṭīkā*, Dharmamitra's *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-prajñāpāramitopadeśa-śātra-ṭīkā* Pras-

phuṭīapada, Abhayākaragupta's *Munimatālamkāra*, Jagaddalanivāsin's *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* commentary *Bhagavaty-Āmnāyānusārīṇi-nāma-vyākhyām*, and Atiśa's *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, all available in Tibetan only, along with the **Mahāyānāvātāra* (*Rudacheng-lun* 入大乘論) extant only in Chinese but very certainly an Indian text. Among these, we may point out that the *Abhisamayālamkāraloka* of Haribhadra and the *Munimatālamkāra* of Abhayākaragupta mention the prophecy of Śāriputra's future Buddhahood as Padmaprabha, and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* includes the passage on a child's play construction of a stūpa. On the other hand, with the exception of the **Mahāyānāvātāra* which refers to the prodigal son story and an allusion in Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka* to the burning house and city of nirvāṇa, I have seen in Indian texts no quotation of, or even reference to, these striking parables for which the sūtra is so famous in East Asia. Finally, I may note that although the Lotus is quoted a number of times in the **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (*Da Zhidulun* 大智度論), since the actual sources of this text are very much in dispute, it would be incautious to accept it as an entirely genuine Indian work, and so I do not bring its evidence into the discussion here.

It is often asserted that the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is one of the fundamental texts of Mahāyāna Buddhism, and numerous discussions of the origins of the Mahāyāna take as their point of departure this very sūtra. Most unfortunately, we actually know nothing or next to nothing about the origins of the Mahāyāna movement. What we are able to judge about the significance of early Mahāyāna scriptures comes from the earliest translations of such works into Chinese, for example by Lokakṣema, and by the use to which the scriptures were put by later authors. The Lotus was indeed translated relatively early, by Dharmarakṣa, and as we have seen it is far from ignored by śāstric authors in India. On the other hand, it is hardly fair to say that it is a main scriptural source for later treatises, and it is in fact relatively rarely referred to. To bring into focus the relative position of the text with respect to other comparable scriptures, we may contrast the degree of quotation of the Lotus to the almost pervasive presence in the treatises of quotations from the Perfection of Wisdom scriptures, and from texts such as the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, the *Samādhirāja*, the *Śālistamba*, the *Tathāgataguhyaka* and so on. On the other extreme, there is for example absolutely no firm Indian evidence whatsoever for the so-called Larger *Sukhāvātīvyūha-sūtra*, so famous and influential in East Asia. While we do have a commentary, extant in Chinese, which purports to be Indian and, again, by Vasubandhu, the **Sukhāvātīvyūhopadeśa* (*Wuliangshoujing youbotishe* 無量壽經憂波提舍), its origins are question-

able. The *Sukhāvativyūha* is not even once quoted or alluded to in any certainly Indian text yet discovered. Of course, this does not imply that the text was not written in India, but only that it was of no apparent importance to Indian authors, at least in so far as we can judge from their works. We must remark, however, that the failure of a text to be important to one group in one context, for example scholastic authors in their treatises, does not by any means imply a general lack of importance. And it may very well be that texts such as the *Sukhāvativyūha* were important to persons, including scholars, who did not register their regard for that scripture in forms which we can now recover. It is far from impossible to imagine, then, the logician Dignāga starting each morning with reverential worship of a scripture to which, nevertheless, he never refers in his writings. Regarding this, we can say nothing at all, but it is essential to be aware of our ignorance, and the limits of our possible evaluations of importance.

In the remaining space, I would like to present the three Sanskrit quotations of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* found in Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. I offer here the following materials for each of the three passages:

- 1) A tentative transcription of the Cambridge manuscript Add. 1478 (MS), first edited by Cecil Bendall,¹³ with the passages correlated to the Kern-Nanjio edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (KN). Regardless of whether the text in the manuscript is correct—and often it is not—I have tried to transcribe exactly what is found there. First letters of each line are printed in bold.
- 2) A transcription of the passage in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Derge and Peking editions), with the differences from the Kanjur translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, which is in principle quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation, underlined (noted as SP in notes). It is very regrettable that we have no reliable edition of the Tibetan text tradition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. In the absence of anything better, I have referred to the edition of Nakamura Zuiryū,¹⁴ despite my grave doubts about the accuracy with which it reports variant readings, even of the few editions upon which it relies.
- 3) The Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the corresponding portions in the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva from which the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation quotes. Here I rely on the Taishō edition alone.

Although it is not possible to take advantage of this material here, we must note that for the first unit of verses we now have the detailed col-

lation of H. Toda. We may note also that this same set of verses is quoted by Atiśa in his *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*.¹⁶

I) Bendall (1897–1902): 47.13–49.4 = MS 29a1–6 = KN 278.10–280.10 = verses XIII.2–5; 8–9; 11–13:

āryasaddharmapūṇḍarīke py uktam ||

ācāragocaram rakṣī asaṃsrṣṭaḥ śucir bhavet |
varjayet saṃstavam nityam rājaputrebhi rāja(bh)i[ḥ] || (2)
ye cāpi rājñām puruṣāḥ kuryāt tehi na saṃstavam |
caṇḍālapauṣkakaiḥ śauṇḍais tīrthikaiś cāpi sarvvaśaḥ || (3)
adhimānin na seveta ' vinaye cāgame sthitān |
arhantasammatān bhikṣūn duḥśīlānś caiva varjayet || (4)
bhikṣuṇim varjayen nityam hāsyasamlāpagocarām |
upāsikān ca varjeyā prakatim anavasthitām || (5)
strīpaṇḍakāś ca ye satvāḥ saṃstavam tair vivarttayet |
kuleṣu cāpi vadhukāḥ kumāryaś ca vivarjayet || (8)
na tāḥ saṃmodayej jātu kauśalyām sādhu pṛcchitum |
saṃstavam ca vivarjeyāt śaukaraurabhrikaiḥ saha || (9)
strīpoṣakāś ca ye satvā varjayet tehi saṃstavam |
naṭair jhallakair mallebhir ye cānyet tādrśā janāḥ || (11)
vāramukhyān na seveta ye cānye bhogavrttinaḥ |
pratisammodanān tebhiḥ sarvvaśaḥ parivarjayet || (12)
yadā ca dharmam deśeyā mātṛgrāmasya paṇḍito |
na caikaḥ praviśet tatra nāpi hāsyasthito bhaved iti || (13)

I) Derge Tanjur 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 32a5–b3; Peking Tanjur 5336, *dbu ma*, ki 39a8–b7:

'*phags pa dam pa'i chos pad ma¹ dkar po* las kyang ||

cho ga spyod yul bsrung bya zhing || 'du 'dzi² med la gtsang bar bya ||
rgyal po dang ni rgyal pu dang || 'dris³ byed rtag tu spang par bya ||
(2)

rgyal po'i zhabs 'bring gang yin dang || gdol pa zol ba chang 'tshong dang ||⁴

mu stegs can ni de dag dang || rnam pa kun du 'dris mi bya || (3)

dge slong 'dul dang lus gnas la⁵ || dgra bcom snyam du sems byed
cing ||

nga rgyal can rnam bsten⁶ mi bya || tshul khirms 'chal rnam rnam
par spang || (4)

rgod⁷ cing smra ba'i spyod yul can || dge slong ma rnam rtag tu
spang ||

mi brtan par ni mngon pa yi || dge bsnyen rnam kyang spang

bar bya || (5)
 bud med ma ning⁸ sems can gang || de dang⁹ 'dris byed rnam par
 spang ||
 khyim rnam su ni mna' ma dang || gzhon nu ma rnam spang bar
bya¹⁰ || (8)
khams dang legs par dri byed pa || de dag nam du'ang dga' mi byed
 ||¹¹
 phag 'tshong pa dang shan pa dang || 'dris par byed pa rnam par
 spang || (9)
 de bzhin du sbyar te ||
 gang dag bud med gso byed dang || gar mkhan gyad dang sil khrol ba
 ||
 gang gzhan de dang 'dra ba yang¹² lde dag rnam dang 'dris byed
 spang || (11)
 res ma'i gtso mo¹³ bsten mi bya || ji snyed longs spyod 'tsho ba gzhan
 ||
 shin tu dga' ba de dag kyang llrnam pa kun du yongs su spang || (12)
 mkhas pas¹⁴ bud med rnam la yang || gang gi dus na chos 'chad pa ||
 der ni gcig pu mi 'gro ste || rgod¹⁵ cing 'dug par mi bya'o ||¹⁶ (13)
 zhes gsungs so ||

1. P: padma 2. D: 'ji 3. D: 'dres
4. SP: gdol pa dang ni zol pa dang ||
5. P: pa 6. D: brten 7. D: dgod 8. D: neng 9. SP: dag
10. SP: rnam par spang
11. SP: de la nam du 'ang dga' mi byed || mkhas dang rgod pa 'dri ba
 dang || 12. D: spang 13. SP: bo 14. P, SP: pa
15. D: dgod 16. P: omits ||

I) T. 1636 Dacheng jipusaxue–lun 大乘集菩薩學論 (XXXII) 84c12–23:
 妙法蓮華經亦作是說。

應入行處。及親近處。常離國王。及國王子。
 大臣官長。兇險戲者。及旃陀羅。外道梵志。
 亦普親近。增上慢人。貪著小乘。三藏學者。
 破戒比丘。名字羅漢。及比丘尼。好戲笑者。
 諸優婆夷。皆勿親近。
 若是人等。以好心來。到菩薩所。爲聞佛道。
 菩薩則以。無所畏心。不懷希望。而爲說法。
 寡女處女。及諸不男。皆勿親近。以爲親厚。
 及至
 販肉自活。街賣女色。如是之人。皆勿親近。

兇險相撲。種種嬉戲。諸姪女等。盡勿親近。
莫濁屏處。爲女說法。若說法時。無得戲笑。

I) T. 262 Miaofa lianhua-jing 妙法蓮華經 (IX) 37b20–c7:

應入行處。及親近處。常離國王。及國王子。
大臣官長。兇險戲者。及旃陀羅。外道梵志。
亦不親近。增上慢人。貪著小乘。三藏學者。
破戒比丘。名字羅漢。及比丘尼。好戲笑者。
深著五欲。求現滅度。諸優婆夷。皆勿親近。
若是人等。以好心來。到菩薩所。爲聞佛道。
菩薩則以。無所畏心。不懷希望。而爲說法。
寡女處女。及諸不男。皆勿親近。以爲親厚。
亦莫親近。屠兒魁膾。畋獵漁捕。爲利殺害。
販肉自活。街賣女色。如是之人。皆勿親近。
兇險相撲。種種嬉戲。諸姪女等。盡勿親近。
莫獨屏處。爲女說法。若說法時。無得戲笑。

II) Bendall (1897–1902): 92.6–94.13 = MS 51b2–52a2 = KN 50.9–12
= verses II.81–82; 51.3–7 = II.86.88a; 52.1–12 = II.92–97:

yasya tu niyatam eva bodhiprāpticihnam asti **tatra** sutarāmavam anyanā
rakṣitavyā | yathoktam āryasaddharmmapuṇḍarikasūtre

iṣṭāmayān mṛttikasañcitān vā prītāḥ prakurvanti jinān stūpān |
uddiśya ye pāmsūkarāsayo pi ' aṭaviṣu' durgeṣu ca kārayanti || (81)

siktāmayā vā puna kūta kṛtvā ye kecid uddiśya jinān stūpān |
kumārakāḥ kriḍiṣu tatra tatra ' te cāpi bodhāya abhūṣi lābhinaḥ || (82)

yāvaḥ ||

ye citrabhittīṣu karonti vigrahaṁ paripūrṇṇagātrān śatapuṇyalak-
ṣaṇān ||

likhet svayañ cāpi likhāpayed vā ' te sarvvi bodhāya abhūṣi lābhinaḥ
|| (86)

ye cāpi kecit tarhi śikṣamāṇāḥ krīḍaratiñ cāpi vinodayanti |
nakhena kāṣṭhena kṛtāsi vigrahān | (87abc)

bhittīṣu puruṣātha kumārakā vā || (88a)

sarvve ca te bodhi abhūṣi lābhinaḥ | (87d)

pe |

vādāpitā jhallaripo pi ye hī ' jalamaṇḍakā vāpy atha maṇḍakā vā |
sugatānam uddiśyatha pūjanārthaṁ ' gītañ ca gītaṁ madhuraṁ
manoḥjñam || (92)

sarvve ca buddhā abhūṣi loke ' kṛtvā (c)a tān bahuvidharatnapūjām |
kim alpakampī sugatāna dhātuṣu ' ekam pi vādāyīya² vādyabhāṇḍam
|| (93)

puṣpeṇa caikena hi pūjayitvā ' anupūrvva drakṣyanti hi buddhakotyaḥ
| (94ab)

yaiś cā[52a]ñjalis tatra kṛtāpi stū(p)e ' paripūrṇṇa ekātalaśaktikā vā |
onāmitaṁ śīrṣa bhaven muhūrttaṁ avanāmitaṁ kāya tathaikavāraṁ |
(95)

namo stu buddhāya kṛtaikavācā ' ye hī tadā dhātudhareṣu teṣu |
vikṣiptacittair api yaikavācā te sarvvi prāptā imam agrabodhim | (96)
sugatāna teṣāṁ tada tasmi kāle ' parinirvṛtānām atha tiṣṭhatām vā |
ye dharmanāmāpi śṅṅūṣu satvās | te³ sarvvi bodhāya abhūṣi lābhina
(97)

iti ||

1. ṣu added in top margin
2. written vā ' dā ' yi ' ya '
3. written satvā | ste

II) Derge Tanjur 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 56b5–57a6; Peking Tanjur 5336,
dbu ma, ki 67b5–68a7:

gang la nges par byang chub 'thob pa'i mtshan ma yod pa de la brnyas
pa shin tu bsrung bar bya ste | *dam pa'i chos pad ma' dkar po'i mdo*
las |

sa dang so phag las ni brtsigs pa yi || rgyal ba'i mchod rten dga'
bzhin³ byas pa dang ||

de phyir sa rdul phung po dag las kyang || mya ngan³ dgon pa dag⁴ tu
byas pa dang || (81)

byis pas⁵ rtsed mor de dang de dag tu || gang gis⁶ rgyal ba de phyir
mchod rten dag |

bye ma las ni phung por byas pa yang || de rnams kyis kyang byang
chub thob par 'gyur ||⁷ (82)

zhes bya ba nas |⁸

gang gis rtsig ngos gzugs kyi ri mo dag | bsod nams brgya mtshan
yongs su rdzogs pa'i sku ||

bdag gis bris sam 'dri ru bcug kyang rung || de dag thams cad byang
chub thob par 'gyur || (86)

skyes bu dag gam⁹ 'on te gzhon nu'ang rung || gang dag la la de ni
slob pa'i tshe ||

rtsed mo dga' dang bsang¹⁰ ba byed pa na || rtsig ngos sen mo shing
bus gzugs bris pa || (87)

de dag thams cad byang chub thob par 'gyur ||¹¹ (88a)

zhes bya ba'i bar du'o || de bzhin du sbyar te ||¹²

bde bar gshegs pa rnams la mchod pa'i phyir || gang dag lcags kyi sil
khrol brdung¹³ bcug dang ||

chu la brdabs dang thal mos¹⁴ brdabs pa dang || yid du 'ong zhing

snyan pa'i glu dbyangs¹⁵ dang || (92)
 ring bsrel de dag rnam mang mchod byas pa || de dag thams cad 'jig
 rten sangs rgyas 'gyur ||
 bde gshegs ring bsrel la ni chung¹⁶ zad dang ||¹⁷ sil snyan gcig brdungs
 pa yi sgra phyung ngam || (93)
 me¹⁸ tog gcig tsam gyis ni mchod pa dang || bde gshegs gzugs dang
 rtsig ngos bris pa la ||
 'khrug bzhin pa yi sems kyis mchod na¹⁹ yang || de dag rim gyis
 sangs rgyas bye ba mthong || (94)
 mchod rten de²⁰ la gang gis thal mo sbyar || yongs su tshangs pa'am
 thal mo ya gcig gam ||
 yang na mgo bo skad cig btud pa dang || de bzhin lan cig lus kyang
 btud pa dang || (95)
 gang gis²¹ ring bsrel gnas pa de dag la || g-yeng²² ba'i sems kyis phyag
 'tshal sangs rgyas zhes ||
 tshig gcig lan 'ga' brjod par byas pa yang || de dag kun gyis²³ byang
 chub mchog 'di thob || (96)
 de tshe bde bar gshegs pa de dag ni || mya ngan 'das sam yang na
 bzhugs kyang rung ||
 sems can gang gis chos 'di'²⁴ ming thos pa || de dag thams cad byang
 chub thob par 'gyur ||²⁵ (97) 相決定得
 zhes ji skad gsungs pa bzhin no ||

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. P: padma | 2. SP: zhing | 3. SP's P: ngan; NDCL: ngam |
| 4. SP's D: dag; others gang | 5. SP: pa | 6. P: gi |
| 7. P: omits | 8. P: omits | 9. D: rgan nam |
| 11. P: omits | 12. P: | 10. SP: gsang |
| 15. SP: blangs | 16. P, SP: cung | 13. SP: rdung |
| 19. P: pa | 17. P: | 14. SP: mo |
| 23. P: gyi | 18. P: mi | 15. SP: g-yangs |
| 24. P, SP: 'di | 19. P: gi | 20. SP: g-yangs |
| 25. P: omits | 21. P: gi | 22. SP: g-yangs |
| | 22. SP: g-yangs | 23. P: gi |
| | 23. P: gi | 24. P, SP: 'di |
| | 24. P, SP: 'di | 25. P: omits |

II) T. 1636 (XXXII) 94a12–b1:

論曰。菩薩於諸補特伽羅。何有少分不作化度不護身者。見有如是。標
 菩提故。於彼佛子不應陵蔑。應當守護。如妙法蓮華經云。

或有起石廟。旃壇及沈水。木檣并餘材。磚瓦泥土等。

若於曠野中。積土成佛廟。乃至童子戲。聚沙爲佛塔。

如是諸人等。皆已成佛道。

乃至

彩畫作佛像。百福莊嚴相。自作若使人。皆已成佛道

乃至童子戲。若草木及筆。或以指爪甲。而畫作佛像。

如是諸人等。皆已成佛道。若人於塔廟。寶像及畫像。

以華香幡蓋。敬心而供養。若使人作樂。擊鼓吹角貝。
 簫笛琴箏篪。琵琶鐃銅鈸。如是衆妙音。盡持以供養。
 或以歡喜心。歌唄頌佛德。乃至一小音。皆已成佛道。
 若人散亂心。乃至以一華。供養於畫像。漸見無數佛。
 或有人禮拜。或復但合掌。乃至舉一手。或復小低頭。
 以此供養像。漸見無量佛。

又云。

若人散亂心。入於塔廟中。一稱南無佛。皆已成佛道。
 於諸過去佛。在世或滅後。若有聞是法。皆已成佛道。

II) T. 262 (IX) 8c21–9a27:

或有起石廟。栴檀及沈水。木檣并餘材。磚瓦泥土等。
 若於曠野中。積土成佛廟。乃至童子戲。聚沙爲佛塔。
 如是諸人等。皆已成佛道。若人爲佛故。建立諸形像。
 刻彫成衆相。皆已成佛道。或以七寶成。鍮石赤白銅。
 白鐵及鉛錫。鐵木及與泥。或以膠漆布。嚴飾作佛像。
 如是諸人等。皆已成佛道。彩畫作佛像。百福莊嚴相。
 自作若使人。皆已成佛道。乃至童子戲。若草木及筆。
 或以指爪甲。而畫作佛像。如是諸人等。漸漸積功德。
 具足大悲心。皆已成佛道。但化諸菩薩。度脫無量衆。
 若人於塔廟。寶像及畫像。以華香幡蓋。敬心而供養。
 若使人作樂。擊鼓吹角貝。簫笛琴箏篪。琵琶鐃銅鈸。
 如是衆妙音。盡持以供養。或以歡喜心。歌唄頌佛德。
 乃至一小音。皆已成佛道。若人散亂心。乃至以一華。
 供養於畫像。漸見無數佛。或有人禮拜。或復但合掌。
 乃至舉一手。或復小低頭。以此供養像。漸見無量佛。
 自成無上道。廣度無數衆。入無餘涅槃。如薪盡火滅。
 若人散亂心。入於塔廟中。一稱南無佛。皆已成佛道。
 於諸過去佛。在世或滅度。若有聞是法。皆已成佛道。

III) Bendall (1897–1902): 352.7–354.3 = MS 160b6–161b2 = KN
 282.5–6; 283.6–13; 284.3–10 = XIII. 24, 26–29, 32–35; 286.3–4:

kathan dharmmadānaṃ dātavyaṃ | yathāryasaddharmmapuṇḍarīke
 bhīhitaṃ ||

kālena (v?)o cintayamā[161a]nu paṇḍitaḥ ' praviśya layanan tatha
 ghaṭṭayitvā |

vipaśya dharmmaṃ imi sarvva yoniśo ' utthāya deśeta alinacittaḥ |
 (24)

sukhasthito bhoti sadā vicakṣaṇo ' sukhaṃ niṣaṇṇas tatha dharmma
 bhāsate |

(u)dāraprajñāpta karitva āsanaṃ ' caukṣe manojñe pṛthivīpradeśe ' |

(26)

caukṣaṅ ca so cīvara prāvaritvā¹ ' suraktaraṅgaṅ ca prasannaraṅgair²
 āsevakaṃ kṛṣṇa tathā daditvā | mahāpramāṇaṅ ca nivāsayitvā | (27)
 sapādapīthasmi niṣadya āsane | vicitraduṣyehi susaṃstṛte 'smin³ |
 sudhautapādaś ca upāruhitvā | snigdgena śīrṣeṇa mukhena cāpi | (28)
 dharmmāsane tatra niṣīdiyānaḥ | ekāgrasatveṣu samam vipaśyaṅ |
 upasaṃharec citrakathāṃ bahūmś ca || bhikṣūnatho bhikṣuṅikās
 tathaiva | (29)

kilāsitāṃś cāpi vivarjayīta || **na** cāpi utpādayi khedasamjñāṃ
 aratiṅ ca sarvvāṃ viśaheta paṇḍitaḥ | maitrībalaṃ paṇḍitaḥ bhāvayec
 ca ' (32)

bhāṣec ca rātrindivam agradharmmāṅ | dṛṣṭāntakoṭīniyutaiḥ sa
 paṇḍitaḥ
saṃharṣayet³ tāṅ ca tathaiva toṣayet | na cāpi kiñcit tanu jān sa⁴
 prārthayet ' (33)

khādyāṅ ca bhojyaṅ ca tathānnapānaṅ | vastrāṅ śayyāsanacīvarāṅ⁵ |
 gilānabhaisajya na cintayet saḥ | na vijñape[161b]t paṇḍitaḥ kiñcid
 anyad⁶ (34)

anyatra cinteya sadā vicakṣaṇaḥ | bhavya buddho ham ime ca satvā
 etac ca me sarvvasukhaupadhānaṃ | yaṃ dharmma śrāvemi ' hitāya
 loke || (35)

atraivāha ||

na ca kasyad antaśo dharmmaprimṇāpy **adhikatar**am anugrahaṃ
 karoti ||

1. Here MS adds erroneously: mahāpramāṇaṅ ca nivāsayitvā |
2. written °ai | rā° 3. ṛṣa added below line 4. ma?
5. Marginal note at bottom of leaf: āsanopari vastraṃ
6. d anya added in top margin

III) Derge Tanjur 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 190a3–b3; Peking Tanjur 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 220a4–b6:

chos kyi sbyin pa ji ltar sbyin par bya zhe na | 'phags pa dam pa'i chos
 padma dkar po'i mdo las gsungs pa |

mkhas pa dus su sems par byed pa na || khang bur zhugs te de bzhin
 sgo bead nas ||

chos 'di thams cad la ni tshul bzhin blta || langs nas zhum pa med pa'i
 sems kyis shod || (24)

mkhas pa bde la rtag tu gnas par 'gyur || bde¹ la 'dug nas de bzhin
 chos kyang ston ||

gtsang zhing yid du 'ong ba'i sa phyogs su || yangs² pa'i stan³ ni rab

tu bshams bting ste || (26)
 bzang po'i tshon gyis legs par kha bsgyur⁴ ba || chos gos gtsang ma
 de ni rab bgos nas ||
 rdul gzan⁵ nag po de bzhin bshams byas la || sham thabs che⁶ tshad
 legs par rab bgos nas || (27)
 bcos bu'i ras rnams sna tshogs legs bting ba || rkang rten bcas pa'i
 khri la rab 'dug cing |
 rkang pa legs par bkur te steng 'dzegs nas || gdong⁷ dang bzhin gyi
 mdangs ni rab snum zhing || (28)
 chos kyi stan de la ni rab 'dug nas || sems can lhags⁸ pa rtse gcig gyur
 rnams la ||
gtam mang sna tshogs mang po smra ba dang⁹ || dge slong dag dang
 dge slong ma rnams dang || (29)
 dge bsnyen rnams dang dge bsnyen ma dag dang || rgyal po dag dang
 rgyal bu rnams la yang ||
 mkhas de¹⁰ rtag tu phrag dog med par ni || sna tshogs don ldan snyan
 pa'i gtam yang ston || (30)*
 le lo dag kyang rnam par rab spangs nas || skyo ba yi ni 'du shes
bskyed mi bya¹¹ ||
 mkhas pas mi dga' thams cad rnam par spang || byams pa'i stobs ni
 'khor la bsgom par bya || (32)
 nyin mtshan du yang chos mehog rab tu bsgom¹² || mkhas pa de¹³ ni
 bye ba khrag khrig dpes ||
 'khor rnams mgu zhing de bzhin dga' bar byed || de la nam yang 'dod
 pa chung¹⁴ zad med || (33)
 zas dang skom dang bza' dang bca' ba dang || gos dang mal cha chos
 gos rnams dang ni ||
 na ba'i gsos sman dag kyang mi bsam ste || 'khor rnams la ni ci yang
 mi bslang ngo || (34)
 gzhan du mkhas pa rtag tu bdag nyid dang || sems can 'di dag sangs
 rgyas 'grub¹⁵ par shog |
 phan phyir 'jig rten chos gang bstan pa de || bdag gi bde ba'i yo byad
 kun snyam sems ||¹⁶ (35)
 zhes bya'o ||
 yang de nyid las | chos kyi rnam grangs 'di rab tu ston¹⁷ pa na |¹⁸ chos
 kyi dga' ba snyoms pa¹⁹ byed de |²⁰ tha na 'ga' tsam la yang chos
 kyi dga' bas lhag par phan 'dogs par mi byed do zhes gsungs so ||

*Note that this entire verse is not found in the Sanskrit text, or Chinese translation!

1. SP: de
2. P: yang
3. P: bstan

4. P: hard to read, but kha sgyur?
 5. SP: zan 6. P: tshes 7. SP: mgo 8. P: lhag
 9. SP: gdam mang rnam pa sna tshogs nye bar ston 10. P: te
 11. SP: skyo ba snyam pa'i 'du shes bskyed mi bya 12. P: sgom
 13. SP: des 14. SP: cung 15. P: grub 16. P: omits ll
 17. SP: bstan 18. SP's D: l; P: ll 19. SP: par 20. D: omits l

III) T. 1636 (XXXII) 142c6–20:

如妙法蓮華經偈云

菩薩有時。入於靜室。以正憶念。隨義觀法。
 菩薩常樂。安隱說法。於清淨地。而施床座。
 以油塗身。澡浴塵穢。著新淨衣。內外俱淨。
 安處法座。隨問爲說。若有比丘。及比丘尼。
 除懶墮意。及懈怠想。離諸憂惱。慈心說法。
 晝夜常說。無上道教。以諸因緣。無量譬喻。
 開示衆生。咸令歎喜。
 衣服臥具。飲食醫藥。而於其中。無所希望。
 但一心念。說法因緣。願成佛道。令衆亦爾。
 是則大利。安樂供養。
 是經復說。以順法故不多不少。

III) T. 262 (IX) 37c22–38a24:

菩薩有時。入於靜室。以正憶念。隨義觀法。
 從禪定起。爲諸國王。王子臣民。婆羅門等。
 開化演暢。說斯經典。其心安隱。無有怯弱。
 ...

菩薩常樂。安隱說法。於清淨地。而施床座。
 以油塗身。澡浴塵穢。著新淨衣。內外俱淨。
 安處法座。隨問爲說。
 若有比丘。及比丘尼。諸優婆塞。及優婆夷。
 國王王子。群臣士民。以微妙義。和顏爲說。
 若有難問。隨義而答。因緣譬喻。敷演分別。
 以是方便。皆使發心。漸漸增益。入於佛道。
 除懶惰意。及懈怠想。離諸憂惱。慈心說法。
 晝夜常說。無上道教。以諸因緣。無量譬喻。
 開示衆生。咸令歡喜。
 衣服臥具。飲食醫藥。而於其中。無所希望。
 但一心念。說法因緣。願成佛道。令衆亦爾。
 是則大利。安樂供養。

38b13:

以順法故不多不少。

Notes

* This paper represents a presentation I made at the 36th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies in Montreal, August 2000, augmented by materials not suitable for presentation in lecture format. I very much regret that a severe lack of the necessary time, inadequate access to materials, and page restrictions on this publication have prevented me from developing the paper as much as I would have wished, and as the topic deserves. I plan to collect together all the relevant materials and present them comprehensively at a later time. I should note and emphasize here at the outset my enormous debt in the very first place to the excellent work of Mochizuki Kaie, without which many aspects of this work would hardly have been possible. The present paper will have proven worthwhile even if it does nothing more than introduce Mochizuki's research and bring his study, apparently largely unknown even in Japan, the attention it deserves. See Mochizuki Kaie 望月海慧, "Chūganha Bunken ni mirareru *Hokekyō* no Juyō" 中觀派文献にみられる『法華經』の受容 [The reception of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in Madhyamaka Literature]. In Taiga Ryūgen 田賀竜彦, ed., *Hokekyō no Juyō to Tenkai* 法華經の受容と展開 (*Hokekyō Kenkyū* 法華經研究 XII) (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店, 1993): 539–569.

I should further note that this paper may be said to constitute one of the first fruits of a joint project of Jens Braarvig (Oslo) and myself to re-edit the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in Sanskrit, along with its Tibetan and Chinese translations, and identifications of all citations.

¹ For the present purposes I leave out of consideration the very much later Nepalese evidence.

² T. 1519, a translation attributed to Bodhiruci; also T. 1520, the *Miaofa lianhua-jinglun youbotishe* 妙法蓮華經論優波提舍, a translation attributed to Ratnamati.

³ Note also that there is an apparent reference to this commentary in Bu ston's 14th century catalogue in his *Chos 'byung*, but nothing else is known of this translation. See Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀, "'Putun Bukkyō-shi' Mokurokubu Sakuin II" 「プトゥン仏教史」目録部索引 [An Index to the Catalogue Portion of Bu ston's *History of Buddhism*]. *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunka Kōryū Shisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 東京大学文学部文化交流研究施設研究紀要 5 (1981): 43–94. See #667: *pad ma dkar po'i 'grel pa dbying ngyen gyis mdzad pa*. See also #664: *pad ma dkar po'i don bsdus pa 100 śloka*. It is not impossible that these represent translations from Chinese.

⁴ See the *Fahua chuanji* 法華傳記 of Sengxiang 僧詳, T. 2068 (LI) 52c25–53a2.

⁵ Corrado Pensa, *L'Abhisamayālamkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena. Primo Abhisamaya. Testo e note critiche*. Serie Orientale Roma 37 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1967): 35.6–9.

⁶ Unrai Wogihara, *Abhisamayālamkāraloka Prajñāpāramitāvyaḥkyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko, 1932–1935. Reprint: 山喜房佛書林, 1973): 52.21–53.2; 133.23–134.1.

⁷ Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Nāgārjuna's Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the Mdo kun las btus pa*. Fontes Tibetici Havnienses 2 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989): 126.1–24.

⁸ Derge Tanjur 3856, *dbu ma, dza* 173b5–6.

⁹ Derge Tanjur 3887, *dbu ma, sa* 146b6, 238b7, 239a1–2.

¹⁰ Derge Tanjur 4029, *sems tsam, bi* 108b1–4.

¹¹ T. 1634 (XXXII) 45c24–26.

¹² 清田寂雲, "Çikṣāsamuccaya ni okeru Hokekyō no In'yōbun" Çikṣāsamuccaya における法華經の引用文 [Quotations of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*].

Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū 印度学仏教学研究 19/1 (1970): 217–220. He refers to the prose at KN 282.9–283.4. According to Kiyota, p. 219, this passage is missing in the six Nepalese manuscripts consulted by Nanjio, but was inserted in KN by Kern on the basis of Central Asian manuscripts. However, see Hirofumi Toda's memorandum at the end of this article. Almost certainly Śāntideva simply abbreviated the passage.

¹³ Cecil Bendall, *Çikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahātāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy, 1897–1902. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).

¹⁴ Nakamura Zuiryū 中村瑞隆, “Chibetto-yaku Hokeyō” チベット訳法華経. *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 2 (1976–) and following.

¹⁵ Hirofumi Toda, “Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Romanized Text.” *Tokushima Daigaku Sōgō Kagakubu Kenkyū Hōkokusho* 徳島大学総合科学部研究報告書 7 (2000): 1–49, with the relevant section at 27–38.

¹⁶ Derge Tanjur 3961, *dbu ma*, gi 102a1–b3. This quotes verses XIII. 1–18ab. See now Mochizuki Kaie 望月海慧, “Dīpankarashurījyūnyāna no *Daikyōshū* ni in'yō sareru Hokeyō” デイパンカラシュリージュ・ニャーナの『大経集』に引用される法華経 [The Lotus Sūtra quoted in Atiśa's *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*]. In Suguro Shinjō 勝呂信静 and Sasaki Kōken 佐々木孝憲, eds., *Hokeyō no Shisō to Tenkai* 法華経の思想と展開. Hokeyō Kenkyū 法華経研究 XIII (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten 平楽寺書店, 2001): 295–324.

Memorandum by Hirofumi Toda

Concerning this prose portion (KN 282.9–283.4), there are two possibilities: (1) Hendrik Kern prepared the prose. (2) Bunyiu Nanjio newly prepared the prose after he had finished the first handwritten text for the KN edition. Nanjio and Hokei Izumi used it as the original text for their Japanese translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (published in 1913), in which the prose portion is not included, making reference to a MS Ekai Kawaguchi had brought from Nepal (K).

1. Kern's “Composition”?

If we take up the possibility of Kern's editing and addition, it gives rise to a question: What manuscripts did he have or keep when he made the final version of the KN edition? It is clear that he had O (Petrovsky MS) and Ca (Cambridge Add. 1683).¹ (Add. 1683 was used for his English translation (published in 1884).)

However, the following portions do not appear in O and, with the exception of 2, in Ca.

1. (282.10) *paścimāyām pañcāsatyām* = A (Royal Asiatic Society)
2. (282.11) *bhāṣate* = A, Ca, B (British Library); *bhāṣati* = Cb (note 12)
3. (282.13) *nīścārayati* = B, A
4. (282.13–283.1) *nāma gṛhītvā 'varṇaṃ bhāṣate na cāvarṇaṃ cārayati* = B

It is surmised that Nanjio prepared the first handwritten Sanskrit text skipping this prose portion. The prose portion is omitted in his Japanese translation,² which is based on this Sanskrit text. Therefore, these facts support the inference that Kern might have supplemented the prose text.

It can be confirmed that Kern had Ca (Add. 1683) as he used it for his English translation along with Add. 1682. But, there is no proof that he had A, B and Cb (Add. 1684). However, unless one assumes that he had these three MSS, the reason why three portions of the above-mentioned texts (1, 3, 4) are adopted in the KN edition and Cb's variant (2) is referred to in a note cannot be clarified.

One possibility is that Kern “composed” the prose portion utilizing O, Cb and other

MSS, based on the fact that A, B and Cb have been kept in Britain. But I think this is highly improbable.

Collation with O

One cannot find complete accordance between the texts in the KN edition and in O. Therefore, the prose portion is not based on O. Some other Nepalese MSS were used.

2. Nanjio's New Addition?

—His Copying of MSS and the Publication of the KN Edition

Nanjio's efforts at copying *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* manuscripts in order to make a collated handwritten Sanskrit text started in the period after 1879 and ended up with his returning to Japan in 1884. Junjiro Takakusu wrote a letter to Kern in 1905, proposing the publication of the SP text prepared by Nanjio. Then Nanjio made a fair copy of the whole text he had completed and sent it to Kern.³ There is a possibility that the prose portion was added at some point either while writing the fair copy or in the period after completing the handwritten copy, including the period after he returned to Japan.

The KN edition was published in four fascicles:

fasc. I (1908), (i), pp. 1–96

fasc. II/III (1909), pp. 97–192/193–288

fasc. IV (1910), pp. 289–384

fasc. V (1912), pp. 385–508, pp. I–XII, 1 pl.⁴

3. Chronology of Nanjio-Izumi's Japanese Translation

A chronological description of Nanjio-Izumi's Japanese translation is as follows:

Feb. 1903	Nanjio starts a serial publication of the translation in the magazine <i>Mujinto</i> (Never-ending Light).
May 1903	Ekai Kawaguchi returns to Japan with Sanskrit MSS including K.
Oct. 1907	Nanjio transfers the handwritten Sanskrit text he had prepared to Izumi. Hereafter Izumi takes over Nanjio's task of translation. (The portion from p. 248, line 6, onward was prepared by Izumi.)
Aug. 1912	The translation is completed by Izumi.
Sept. 10, 1913	Izumi writes the preface.
Sept. 25, 1913	The translation is published.

Izumi's Japanese translation was rendered wholly based on Nanjio's handwritten Sanskrit text and Kern's English translation.

4. Most Probable Presumption

My general impression and most probable presumption is that Nanjio hurriedly prepared the prose portion which was lacking in the first handwritten draft in the process of making a fair copy. There were only three notes to the prose portion. See p. 282, note 12; p. 283, notes 1, 2.⁵ Kern must have added other notes based on O. This may reasonably explain the problem of why there are few variants in the notes. My idea leans to the supposition that Nanjio prepared the prose text. Incidentally, the prose portion appears in five MSS: A, K (University of Tokyo Library, no. 414), B, Ca and Cb.

Notes:

¹ The KN edition's preliminary notice refers to MSS with the abbreviations: Ca

(Add. 1682), Cb (Add. 1683). Actually however, it should read Ca (Add. 1683), Cb (Add. 1684).

See Akira Yuyama, *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, Canberra 1970, p. 12, note 9, p. 13, note 10.

² Bunyiu Nanjio and Hokei Izumi (南條文雄・泉芳環), *Bonkan Taishō Shinyaku Hokeyō* (梵漢対照新訳法華經; A New [Japanese] Translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in Collation of Sanskrit and Chinese Texts), Kyoto 1913, p. 316, footnote.

³ Yensho Kanakura (金倉圓照), “Indogaku yori mataru hokeyō,” *Hokeyō no seiritsu to tenkai*, *Hokeyō Kenkyū III* (「インド学より見たる法華經」法華經研究 III, 『法華經の成立と展開』“Publications of the Sanskrit Texts of the Lotus Sutra,” The Lotus Sutra and the Development of Buddhist Thought, Lotus Sutra Studies III), second printing, Kyoto 1974, p. 506.

See Nanjio’s preface in the KN edition, p. II, lines 11–14.

⁴ Akira Yuyama, *Eugène Burnouf: The Background to His Research into the Lotus Sutra*, Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, vol. 3, Tokyo, 2000, p. 134.

⁵ P. 282, note 12, “ti Cb” and p. 283, note 1, “All but O”: Here must have existed more detailed variants, which Kern shortened.

P. 283, note 2, “the rest”: There must also have been some detailed variants, which Kern shortened.

Postscript

Concerning transliterated texts of the prose portion appearing in MSS, see the following:

(1) Nepalese MSS:

Hirofumi Toda (戸田宏文), ed., *Kenkyū Hōkokusho VIII (2001)*, Tokushima Daigaku Sōgōkagakubu (『研究報告書』徳島大学総合科学部, Report on Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra Manuscripts VIII (2001), Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, University of Tokushima), pp. 14–18.

(2) Gilgit MSS, Group A:

Shoko Watanabe, ed., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit, Part Two, Romanized Text*, Tokyo 1975, p. 254, line 28–p. 255, line 8.

(3) Gilgit MSS, Group C:

Toda, ed., “Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra Gilgit Manuscripts (Groups B and C),” *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Kiyō, Jinbun shakai kagaku* (『徳島大学教養部 (人文・社会科学)』, Journal of Cultural and Social Science, College of General Education, University of Tokushima), vol. 14 (1979), p. 276, 3172.2–9 (= *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Fascimile Edition)*, Śāta-pīṭaka Series vol. 10, part 10, New Delhi 1974, no. 3172).

(4) Kashgar MS (= O):

Toda, ed., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text*, Tokushima 1981, pp. 137–138, 269a3–270a2.

Klaus Wille, ed., *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq*, Lotus Sutra Manuscripts series 3, Tokyo 2000, p. 176.

(5) Farhād-Bēg MS:

Ibid., p. 241, 18b2–19a1.